

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-60 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 12, 18, 23, 27, 33, 42, 50, 53 and 56 being independent. Independent claims 1, 6, 12, 18, 23, 27, 33, 42 and 56 have been amended, claims 50-55 have been withdrawn from consideration, and claim 10 has been canceled.

Claims 1-5, 27, 29-32 and 56-60, including independent claims 1, 27 and 56, have been rejected as being anticipated by Shi, U.S. Patent No. 5,811,177. Each of independent claims 1, 27 and 56 has been amended to recite a connection wiring that is formed over the substrate and on which the passivation film is formed. The claims further recite that the connection wiring is in contact with a portion of the absorption film and a portion of the passivation film. These features are supported in the application at, for example, Figs. 10A and 10B, and the accompanying text. In general, this arrangement permits the absorption film to cover an EL element and a portion of the connection wiring in order to prevent deterioration of the EL element due to oxygen and moisture, and also permits the passivation film to cover the entire surface of the absorption film and the connection wiring.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 27 and 56 and their dependent claims at least because Shi does not describe or suggest a connection wiring arranged in the manner recited in the claims. In particular, Shi does not describe or suggest forming a passivation film on a connection wiring or having a connection wiring contact both the passivation film and an absorption film. For example, Fig. 3 of Shi, which the Examiner relies upon as describing the claimed subject matter, does not show a connection wiring contacting the films 24 and 26, which the Examiner has equated with the absorption and passivation films. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8, 11-14, 16, 17, 23, 24, 26, 33-39 and 41, including independent claims 6, 12, 23 and 33, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Harvey, U.S. Patent No. 5,757,126, in view of Hidler, U.S. Patent No. 4,599,538. Each of independent claims 6 and 12 has been amended to recite that the connection wiring is in contact with a portion of the absorption film and a portion of the passivation film, and that the sealant is in contact with the passivation film

and is not overlapped with the absorption film. Similarly, independent claim 23 has been amended to recite that the connection wiring is in contact with a portion of the inorganic hygroscopic film and a portion of the passivation film, and that the sealant is in contact with the passivation film and is not overlapped with the inorganic hygroscopic film. Like claim 23, independent claim 33 has been amended to recite that the sealant is in contact with the passivation film and is not overlapped with the inorganic hygroscopic film. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, Figs. 10A and 10B and the accompanying text.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 12, and their dependent claims, at least because neither Harvey, Hidler, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a connection wiring that is in contact with a portion of the absorption film and a portion of the passivation film, or a sealant that is in contact with the passivation film and is not overlapped with the absorption film, as recited in claims 6 and 12. For example, Fig. 4 of Harvey, which the Examiner relies upon as describing the claimed subject matter, does not show a connection wiring contacting the films 26 and 28, which the Examiner has equated with the absorption and passivation films. Harvey does not show this arrangement anywhere else, and Hidler does not remedy this failure of Harvey.

In addition, neither Harvey, Hidler, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a sealant that is in contact with a passivation film and is not overlapped with an absorption film, where the passivation film is formed over the absorption film. While the Examiner relies on Hidler as showing a sealant 62, this sealant is not formed on a passivation film that is formed over an absorption film. Instead, the sealant 62 is formed on a silicon nitride layer 60 that is formed directly on an aluminum lead-in 50. Moreover, if one were to form the sealant 62 of Hidler on the film 28 of Harvey, which the Examiner has equated with the passivation film, the sealant 62 would overlap with the film 26 of Harvey, which the Examiner has equated with the absorption film.

Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reasons presented above.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 and its dependent claims for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 6 and 12. The difference between claims 6 and 23 is that, while claim 6 recites an absorption film, claim 23 recites an inorganic hygroscopic film. Since the Examiner has treated these films as corresponding to the same elements in the prior art, the reasons presented above as to why the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn are equally applicable to claim 23. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn because neither Harvey, Hidler, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a connection wiring that is in contact with a portion of the inorganic hygroscopic film and a portion of the passivation film, as recited in claim 23.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 33 and its dependent claims because neither Harvey, Hidler, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a sealant that is in contact with a passivation film and is not overlapped with an inorganic hygroscopic film, where the passivation film is formed on the inorganic hygroscopic film. While the Examiner relies on Hidler as showing a sealant 62, this sealant is not formed on a passivation film that is formed on an inorganic hygroscopic film. Instead, the sealant 62 is formed on a silicon nitride layer 60 that is formed directly on an aluminum lead-in 50. Moreover, if one were to form the sealant 62 of Hidler on the film 28 of Harvey, which the Examiner has equated with the passivation film, the sealant 62 would overlap with the film 26 of Harvey, which the Examiner has equated with the inorganic hygroscopic film. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 9, 15, 25 and 40 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Hidler and Shi. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Shi does not remedy the failure of Harvey and Hidler to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims.

Claims 18-22, including independent claim 18, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tang, U.S. Patent No. 5,684,365, in view of Shi. Claim 18 has been amended to recite a passivation film formed on the absorption film, and a second substrate connected to the first substrate through a sealant that is in contact with the passivation film and is not overlapped with

the absorption film. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, Figs. 8B, 10A and 10B, and the accompanying text. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Tang, Shi, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests an absorption film, a passivation film, and a sealant arranged in the manner recited in claim 18.

Claim 28, which depends from claim 27, has been rejected as being unpatentable over Shi in view of Bulovic, U.S. Patent No. 6,046,543. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Bulovic does not remedy the failure of Shi to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 27.

Claims 42-49, including independent claim 42, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tang in view of Shi and Hidler. Claim 42 has been amended to recite a passivation film formed on the inorganic hygroscopic film and a sealant in contact with the passivation film and not overlapped with the inorganic hygroscopic film. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, Figs. 8B, 10A and 10B, and the accompanying text. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because, for the reasons discussed above, neither Tang, Shi, Hidler, nor any combination of the three describes or suggests an inorganic hygroscopic film, a passivation film, and a sealant arranged in the manner recited in claim 42.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. No fees are believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/3/05



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640